قسم الترجمة
Translation Department

Translation

Chapter One From the Answers of the Open Meeting

By Shaykh al-Sadiq bil-Haqq
Hassan ibn Husayn (Abu Salman al-Somali)

Originally Published in 1433 AH | 2012

مؤسسة الفردوس للإنتاج الإعلامي ١٤٤٧ هـ

Chapter One

From the Answers of the Open Meeting

By Shaykh al-Ṣādiq bi-l-Ḥaqq

Ḥassān ibn Ḥusayn (Abū Salmān al-Ṣūmālī)

– may Allāh preserve him –

Muḥarram 1433 AH | November 2012

Translated by the al-Firdous Foundation

Sha’ban 1447 AH | January 2026

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

All praise is for Allāh, Lord of the worlds, and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allāh, his family, and all his companions.

To proceed:

Due to accumulated work, increasing responsibilities, and ongoing worries and sorrows, I am unable to address all questions and answer them with the required detail. Therefore, I decided to divide them into two chapters.

Chapter One contains answers to the following questions:

1. What is the ruling on living among disbelievers in dār al-ḥarb?
2. What is the ruling on one who migrates from the lands of the mujāhidīn to lands under crusader occupation?
3. What is your view of Ṣūfīs, especially those who supported occupation?
4. What is the ruling on those who call the mujāhidīn khawārij or takfīrīs?
5. What is the ruling on abandoning jihād and sufficing with jihād al-nafs?
6. Is it permissible to target people who hold beliefs of grave-worshippers but do not fight?

First Question: What is the ruling on living among the disbelievers in the Dār al-Ḥarb?

Answer: And Allah guides to the truth. The issue of living among the disbelievers in the abodes of war branches from the issue of Hijrah from Dār al-Kufr and the ruling on residing there. The scholars have differed regarding it, and their views can be distilled into the following points.

The first issue: The Ummah unanimously agreed on the obligation of Hijrah from Mecca to Medina during the time of the Prophet ﷺ, and some, such as al-Wāḥidī and al-Baghawī, added that it was a condition for the validity of Islam. Then this was abrogated after the Conquest by his statement, “There is no Hijrah after the Conquest (lā hijrata baʿda al-fatḥ).” They cited as evidence the apparent meanings of the following: “Why are you divided into two groups concerning the hypocrites, while Allah has cast them back for what they earned? Do you wish to guide those whom Allah has led astray? Whomsoever Allah leads astray, you will never find for him a way. They wish that you disbelieve as they disbelieved so that you would be equal; so do not take from among them allies until they make Hijrah in the path of Allah. If they turn away, then seize them and kill them wherever you find them, and do not take from among them any ally or helper” (Qur’an 4:88–89). The apparent meaning of the

verses indicates that they apostatised by abandoning Hijrah and turning back from it, and that their Islam is not accepted except with Hijrah, and not accepted without it, because Allah forbade allegiance (wilāyah) to them until they migrate in the path of Allah and commanded their killing when they refused Hijrah.

And His saying: “Indeed, those whom the angels take while wronging themselves…” (Qur’an 4:97), for Allah did not reproach them except for abandoning Hijrah and made it a cause for their abode to be Hell. And the statement of the Prophet ﷺ concerning the illness of Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ when he visited him in Mecca: “O Allah, complete for my companions their Hijrah and do not cause them to turn back on their heels,” narrated by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

The second issue: The majority of the scholars of Islam held that Hijrah from Mecca to the Messenger ﷺ was not a condition for the validity of Islam, but rather was obligatory upon the one able to perform it. Those mentioned were declared disbelievers because of Allah’s report that they disbelieved and that they wished disbelief for the rest of the believers, not merely because of residing in Dār al-Ḥarb.

The evidence is His saying: “And those who believe but do not migrate, you have no protective allegiance over them at all until they migrate; but if they seek your help in the religion, then upon you is the duty of help, except against a people between you and whom there is a treaty” (Qur’an 8:72). Allah obligated the believers to support them in Dār al-Ḥarb and called them believers despite their lack of Hijrah, and support is only obligatory for a believer. As for the apostate, his support is not obligatory.

And because Saʿd ibn Khawlah رضي الله عنه was among those who died in Mecca without having migrated, as related by ʿĪsā ibn Dīnār and others, or he migrated then returned after witnessing the Battle of Badr as al-Bukhārī reported, and he is a believer by consensus, though the Prophet ﷺ disliked that.

The aspect of the evidence is that Allah named them believers and commanded their support, and He commands only the support of a believer, whereas the apostate is not to be supported under any circumstance.

If it is said that what is meant in the verse of Sūrat al-Anfāl are only the oppressed who are unable to migrate, so that the verse is general but specified by the oppressed according to the preceding verses and apparent meanings, the response is that supporting the oppressed is obligatory upon every people whether there is between us and them a treaty or not, because they have the ruling of believers due to the completeness of their faith since they are excused. As for those who are not oppressed, they are not excused, so supporting them becomes obligatory upon the people of Dār al-Ḥarb due to their faith, and it is not obligatory upon those bound by treaty due to the deficiency of their faith.

As for the response to the apparent meanings of the verses, it is that Hijrah was a sign of faith and a criterion of Islam in the time of the Prophet ﷺ by which the believer was distinguished from the hypocrite; the hypocrite of Mecca was identified by abandoning Hijrah from Mecca to Medina, and if Allah informed His Prophet ﷺ of his disbelief, then he was a disbeliever, and the hypocrite of Medina was identified by abandoning striving (jihād) in the path of Allah with His Messenger.

Allah تعالى says: “Those who made excuses from among the Bedouins came to be permitted, and those who lied to Allah and His Messenger sat back; those who disbelieved among them will be afflicted with a painful punishment” (Qur’an 9:90), so He named them disbelievers. The difference between them was that the hypocrite in Dār al-Ḥarb had applied to him the rulings of the combatants, such as killing, captivity, and enslavement, while the hypocrite in Dār al-Islām had his blood, property, and children protected by outward Islam and the rulings of the Muslims applied to him.

As for one who did not migrate from Mecca to Medina and Allah did not inform of his apostasy and disbelief, then he remains upon his faith; for this reason al-ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه remained in Mecca after his Islam and before the Conquest, and the Prophet ﷺ did not say that his Islam was invalid due to residing in Dār al-Ḥarb and disbelief.

As for His saying: “Indeed, those whom the angels take…” the verse was revealed concerning people who spoke Islam and then went out with the polytheists to Badr, increasing their numbers, and they were killed on the Day of Badr, and Allah informed of their wrongdoing to themselves. Wrongdoing here may be the wrongdoing of disbelief or the wrongdoing of sin, because disbelief, when it occurs without contextual indicators, refers to major disbelief, but it may also refer to ingratitude and then requires a contextual indicator, as in His saying: “You committed your deed which you committed while you were among the disbelievers” (Qur’an 26:19).

As for wrongdoing, it is a shared term, and when it occurs without contextual indicators, it is not a definitive text for the greater wrongdoing; rather, it is determined by contextual indicators. Allah تعالى says: “Indeed, shirk is great wrongdoing (ẓulmun ʿaẓīm)” (Qur’an 31:13), and He says, informing about His Prophet Yūnus عليه السلام: “There is no deity but You; glory be to You; indeed I was among the wrongdoers” (Qur’an 21:87). Far be it from Allah that this refers to disbelief and shirk from which there is no success, and no Muslim has differed that the prophets are protected from disbelief.

The third issue: The scholars differed regarding the ruling of Hijrah during the time of the Prophet ﷺ from places other than Mecca, may Allah honour it, protect it from the plots of enemies, and purify it from the filth of the ṭawāghīt into three opinions.

The first opinion: Hijrah from the lands of disbelief to the Prophet ﷺ was not obligatory. This was the view of Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām and others. They held that Hijrah was not obligatory because the Prophet ﷺ did not command those Arabs who accepted Islam to migrate to him, nor did he condemn them for remaining in their own lands. When he would send out a military expedition, he would say to its commander: “If you meet your enemy from among the polytheists, call them to three things (or three qualities). Whichever of them they respond to, accept it from them and refrain from fighting them. Call them to Islam; if they accept, accept it from them and refrain from fighting them. Then call them to move from their land to the land of the emigrants (Dār al-Muhājirīn) and inform them that if they do so, they will have the same rights and duties as the emigrants. But if they refuse and choose their own lands, inform them that they will be like the Bedouin Muslims: the ruling of Allah that applies to the believers applies to them, but they will have no share in fayʾ or ghanīmah unless they strive alongside the Muslims.” This ḥadīth was narrated by Muslim, Aḥmad, al-Tirmidhī, Abū Dāwūd, and Ibn Mājah.

The second opinion: Hijrah from the rest of the lands of war to the lands of Islam is obligatory upon the one who is unable to manifest his religion, and not obligatory upon the one who is able to manifest his religion, whether through tribal protection (ʿashīrah) or leadership (riyāsah), just as that was possible for al-ʿAbbās ibn ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib and others like him among the Muslims. Despite that, Hijrah remains recommended for such a person from the lands of war. This is the position of the majority of the scholars of Islam.

The third opinion: Some of the scholars went to the view of declaring disbelief upon one who resides in Dār al-Ḥarb while having the ability to perform Hijrah. Imām al-faqīh al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy (d. 169 AH), may Allah have mercy on him, said: “Whoever resides in the land of the enemy, even if he claims Islam, while he is able to move to the Muslims, then his rulings are the rulings of the polytheists. And if a ḥarbī accepts Islam and then remains in their lands while he is able to leave, then he is not a Muslim; he is judged with the rulings applied to the people of war regarding his wealth and his life. And if a man goes to Dār al-Ḥarb without having apostatised from Islam, then he is an apostate by his abandonment of Dār al-Islām.”

This is also the madhhab of Imām Ibn Ḥazm, may Allah have mercy on him, who said: “If he only remains there for worldly gain which he attains, and he is like a dhimmī among them while he is able to join the body of Muslims and their land, then he is not far from disbelief, and we see no excuse for him… As for the one who resides in the land of the Qarāmiṭah by choice, then he is a disbeliever without doubt, because they openly proclaim disbelief and abandonment of Islam, and we seek refuge in Allah from that… The disbeliever from whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ declared himself free is the one who resides among the polytheists.”

The conclusion of the matter: Hijrah from Dār al-Ḥarb or from a land of bidʿah takes the following rulings.

First: The prohibition of residing in the lands of the disbelievers for the one who is unable to manifest his religion while being able to perform Hijrah. This is the view of the majority of the jurists.

Second: The absence of obligation upon the one who is unable to migrate due to illness, coercion, or weakness.

Third: Recommendation for the one who is able to migrate and able to manifest his religion, while some scholars held it to be obligatory.

Fourth: Bidʿah is treated like kufr regarding the obligation or recommendation of Hijrah. As for other sins, Hijrah is recommended and not obligatory because of them, unless the unlawful becomes dominant in the land and the lawful becomes rare; in that case, seeking the ḥalāl becomes an obligation.

Second Question: What is the ruling on one who migrates away from the lands of the mujahidīn and migrates to lands under crusader occupation?

Answer, and Allah guides to the truth: A land is only attributed to whoever has dominance over it, who governs it, and who possesses it, as Allah تعالى said: “I will show you the abode of the defiantly disobedient” (Qur’an 7:145).

Thus, Dār al-Islām is that in which dominance belongs to the Muslims. Whoever manifests Islam therein is treated as a Muslim, and it is not permissible to search into his inner reality except regarding one whose bidʿah is known with certainty.

And Dār al-Kufr is that in which dominance belongs to the people of disbelief and shirk. Fighting its people is obligatory, and everyone found within it is treated as a disbeliever except one whose Islam becomes manifest with certainty, because rulings are attached to the majority rather than the minority. Do you not see that the ruling concerning those in Dār al-Islām and Dār al-Ḥarb is attached to what is predominant and general rather than what is specific and rare, such that those in Dār al-Islām become protected from being killed, despite knowing that within it are those who deserve killing such as the apostate, the heretic, and the belligerent? And those in Dār al-Ḥarb are considered permissible to fight, despite the presence therein of a Muslim merchant or captive. Thus all other foundational principles operate according to this methodology.

Every land or place over which the people of unbelieving innovations (al-bidaʿ al-kufriyyah), such as the Qarāmiṭah, the Jahmiyyah, and the like, have gained dominance, if the people of Ahl al-Sunnah therein are oppressed such that they cannot remain except by concealing their madhhab or by living under a covenant, then that land is Dār Kufr.

And every land or place in which there are people of Islam and people of disbelief, yet neither party dominates the other, or in which the people of truth and the people of unbelieving innovations coexist and it is possible to manifest the true madhhab without taqiyyah, without covenant, and without jizyah, then that place is neither Dār Kufr, nor Dār Islām, nor Dār Fisq; rather, each person is dealt with according to what he outwardly manifests.

This is the formulation of the Ḥanafī scholars in their books, and it is most consistent with the principles and legal foundations. It is also said to be the view of the majority of jurists.

The description of a land as Dār Kufr, Dār Īmān, or Dār Fisq is not an inherent permanent attribute of the land itself; rather, it is an incidental attribute dependent on its inhabitants. Thus, the states of lands resemble the states of individuals: a man may at one time be Muslim, at another disbeliever; at one time a believer, at another a hypocrite; at one time righteous and pious, at another sinful; at one time corrupt and wretched, as Ibn Taymiyyah stated.

Whoever leaves Dār al-Islām and migrates to Dār al-Kufr due to oppression he fears or harm that has afflicted him, without aiding against the Muslims, does not thereby become a disbeliever.

If he goes to Dār al-Ḥarb for trade or similar reasons, the scholars differed: Mālik, Ibn Ḥazm, and Ibn Rushd al-Jadd prohibited it, lest the rulings of the disbelievers be applied to him, while the majority inclined toward permissibility under its conditions.

If he goes to Dār al-Ḥarb neither for trade nor due to compulsion, then he is not thereby an apostate according to the statement of the majority of scholars.

Imām Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Tamīmī al-Jawharī (d. 350 AH), may Allah have mercy on him, said in Nawādir al-Fuqahāʾ: “They unanimously agreed that whoever joins Dār al-Ḥarb not for trade nor due to compulsion is not thereby an apostate, though he is blameworthy for joining them, except for al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ, who said: he is thereby an apostate.”

Something similar is found in al-Iqnāʿ fī Masāʾil al-Ijmāʿ by Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsī, quoting from al-Nawādir, though there it appears with the wording: “not for trade nor for fighting.”

Al-faqīh al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy and Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm held the view of disbelief (takfīr) concerning one who joins Dār al-Kufr and shirk by choice, as mentioned in Mukhtaṣar Ikhtilāf al-ʿUlamāʾ, issue no. 1631, and al-Muḥallā by Ibn Ḥazm, issue no. 2202.

Among their evidences is the ḥadīth of Jarīr ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Bajalī رضي الله عنه, attributed to the Prophet ﷺ: “If a slave flees to the land of shirk, his blood becomes lawful.” And in another narration: “He has disbelieved until he returns.” The narrator said: A slave of Jarīr fled, so he captured him and struck his neck. This was narrated by Muslim, Abū ʿAwānah, al-Nasāʾī, and Abū Dāwūd.

Al-Sijistānī cited it in Kitāb al-Ḥudūd under the chapter: “The ruling regarding the one who apostatises,” and al-Nasāʾī cited it in Kitāb al-Muḥārabah in his Sunan.

The majority interpreted the ḥadīth as referring to one who considers such action permissible.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ rejected this interpretation and held that the ḥadīth applies to both the one who deems it permissible and the one who does not.

Some interpreted the disbelief mentioned in the report as minor disbelief (kufr aṣghar), and this was rejected by al-ʿIzz ibn ʿAbd al-Salām, who interpreted it as major disbelief.

It was also interpreted as referring to abandoning Islam and choosing shirk, as Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭaḥāwī رحمه الله said: “This is understood as his abandoning Islam and choosing shirk.”

Abū Bakr al-Jaṣṣāṣ said in his refutation of al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ: “As for the statement of al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ that the Muslim who joins Dār al-Ḥarb becomes an apostate, this contradicts the Book and the consensus, because Allah تعالى said: ‘Those who believe but do not migrate, you have no protective allegiance over them at all until they migrate’ – so He declared them believers despite their remaining in Dār al-Ḥarb after their Islam, and He made their support obligatory upon us by His saying: ‘And if they seek your help in the religion, then upon you is the duty of help.’ If what he said were correct, it would be obligatory that merchants not be permitted to enter Dār al-Ḥarb under safe-conduct, and that they would thereby become apostates. This is not the view of anyone. If someone were to argue with the narration we were told from Jarīr that the Prophet ﷺ said: ‘If a slave flees to the polytheists, his blood becomes lawful,’ then this is understood by us to refer to one who has joined them having apostatised from Islam, because the mere fleeing of a slave does

not make his blood lawful, and joining Dār al-Ḥarb is like the merchant entering it under safe-conduct, which does not make his blood lawful."

If a person migrates to Dār al-Kufr out of hatred for the people of Islam and love for the people of disbelief, then he is an apostate from the religion and deserving of no honour, and this becomes evident through the contextual indicators that point to it.

Third Question: The brotherly mujahideen have made efforts in combating the grave-worshipping Sufis. We have heard that some Sufis supported the occupation. What is your view on the Sufis, and how do you deal with those affiliated with them?

Answer, and may Allah guide to the right path:

The term *Sufi* has become a broad label that can include both truthful people and *zindiqs*, polytheists, apostates, or atheists. Whoever believes the Messenger ﷺ in what he conveyed, obeys what he commanded, and refrains from what he prohibited, is considered among the truthful and the righteous.

Whoever turns away from that, contradicts his teachings, or acts contrary to what he commanded, becomes a *zindiq*. This is the case for many atheists who affiliate with Sufism, such as *Ibn Sina, Ibn al-Farid, Ibn ʿArabi al-Tāʾī, al-ʿAfif al-Tilmisani,* and *al-Qunawi*, who promoted *wahdat al-wujud*, which is called Sufism.

Therefore, someone who affiliates with Sufism, whether a common person or otherwise, and does not add beliefs or actions that constitute disbelief or sin according to Shariah, is not subject to *takfir* or *fasq*, although many scholars consider such affiliation as innovative.

As for the grave-worshipping Sufis, whose polytheism is widely known. From seeking help from the deceased, slaughtering for other than Allah, opposing monotheism and its followers, and similar acts. They are disbelievers and are to be fought like all polytheists and disbelievers according to both worldly and religious laws.

The general followers among the polytheist Sufis, such as common *Jahmiyyah*, if they believe or act according to the polytheism and disbelief of their scholars, are like the general followers of Jews or Christians.

If their actions amount only to affiliation with Sufism, the ruling on them is as previously explained.

As for a Sufi who only adheres to the Ashʿarite principles regarding names, attributes, and the speech of Allah, without adding known deviations from the Salaf's principles established on Qur'an, Sunnah, and consensus, there is scholarly disagreement about *takfir*. Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in his work *Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah* that scholars differed regarding declaring Ashʿarites as disbelievers. Their doctrine, in reality, traces back to *Jahmiyyah, Muʿtazilah,* and some hadith scholars. According to the followers of the hadith, part of Ahl al-Sunnah, anyone who claims "Allah has no limit" meaning that Allah is everywhere or not established on the Throne, is an apostate and joins the disbelievers, rejecting Allah, His signs, and what the Messenger ﷺ conveyed (cited from *al-Hafiz al-Dushti* in *Ithbat al-Hadd lil-Lah*).

Imam ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Mahdi said: “Whoever claims Allah did not speak to Musa, he should be asked to repent; if he does not, his neck should be struck.”

Wahb ibn Jarir ibn Hazm said: “The Jahmiyyah *zandaqa* claim that Allah is not established on the Throne.” Later Ash‘arites clarify differently.

Other scholars, including Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Faryabi, Imam Abu Ma‘mar al-Hadhli, Imam Ahmad ibn Sinan al-Qattan al-Wasiti, and others, all stated that denying Allah’s speech, knowledge, or attributes constitutes disbelief.

Regarding Sufis who support occupation forces or others opposing Muslims, they are considered *kafir murtad* and subject to the rules of apostasy, based on Qur’an verses:

)Do not take the disbelievers as allies instead of the believers; whoever does so has nothing with Allah(,

)And whoever takes them as allies is indeed one of them(,

)Even if they believe in Allah and the Prophet, they would not take them as allies(,

)You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day that take as friends those who oppose Allah and His Messenger(.

These verses establish that prohibited allegiance is a form of disbelief taking one out of Islam. Abu Ishaq Ibrahim al-Zajjaj (311H) stated: “Whoever aids them against the Muslims, he is with those who aided them.”

Imam Abu Ja‘far al-Tabari stated that Allah forbade believers from taking Jews and Christians as helpers or allies over the believers, and anyone who does so is in rebellion and disobedience, sharing in their punishment.

Imam Abu Ja‘far al-Nahhas explained that assisting such people against Muslims makes one an ally of their disbelief and requires enmity towards them; their protection, secrets, and support are forbidden to Muslims.

Abu Mansur al-Maturidi explained that the prohibition of allegiance includes religious, military, and worldly aid, and anyone who does so falls under these prohibitions depending on intention.

The scholars generally divide prohibited allegiance into two types:

1. **Al-wilayah that constitutes takfir**:
    - Those who follow their religion (thus aiding them in all ways) or help them against Muslims.
2. **Al-wilayah that only entails worldly interaction**:

- Interaction in commerce or companionship without adopting their religion or helping them against Muslims.

Even aiding them out of mercy or protecting them without allegiance is not prohibited.

In summary, anyone who supports occupation forces, Sufis who ally with disbelievers, or those who assist them against Muslims, is a *kafir murtad*, because allegiance and support for them entail collaboration against believers, both in worldly and religious terms. Ibn Taymiyyah said: “Al-wilayah entails cooperation and assistance,” and Fakhr al-Din al-Razi stated that prohibited allegiance always means assistance.

Sheikh Muhammad al-Bashir al-Ibrahimi summarized: “Supporting the colonizer is leaving Islam. Al-wilayah is essentially loyalty, support, and assistance; its prohibition is based on opposing Islam and aiding its enemies. Anyone who allies with enemies of Islam has committed a major breach of faith, whether individually or collectively.”

Muslims are thus obliged: do not ally with colonizers; do not trust them; do not make treaties with them; do not fear them; and do not cooperate with them in war or peace, because any form of allegiance is a departure from Islam.

Fourth Question: What is the ruling on those who call the mujahideen Kharijites or takfiris? Our esteemed shaykh, we seek a detailed clarification between the attributes of the khawarij and the attributes of the mujahideen.

The answer, by Allah the Guide to the straight path: Accusing the people of tawhid and jihad of khawarij or takfir without justification is an old disease whose fire has burned many from Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama‘ah. It is an accusation with no value or basis in reality, a tactic of the weak and a weapon of those lacking evidence. This practice is not new. Throughout history, opponents incapable of proof have relied on this slander to fight the people of truth and religion. The calamity of our time is when the opponent becomes the judge, a trial for our youth and scholars alike. Abu al-Tayyib said:

And no hope for salvation exists for the opponent

On the day his opponent is the judge

O most just of people, except in dealing with me

You are the opponent and the judge

People of harshness and the scholars of combating terrorism have habitually accused the mujahideen of khawarij and takfir, a naive and false accusation based on inverted understanding of matters of iman, kufr, and their related ahkam.

It was said to Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal: Was Ibn Abi Dhi’b a qadariy? They replied: All those upon whom sins were emphasized, they said: he is qadari. Shaykh al-Islam pointed out in Minhaj al-Sunnah that for this reason, al-Hasan al-Basri was attributed to qadari.

Similarly, today those who call for resisting enemies, liberating Islamic lands, and labeling apostates and hypocrites correctly are called kharij takfiri.

Shaykh Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Hasan al-Sheikh said: If we say none is worshiped except Allah, none is invoked except Him, none is hoped for except Him, and none is relied upon except Him, and similar forms of worship due only to Allah, and whoever directs them to other than Allah is a kafir or mushrik, then they say: you innovate and accuse the ummah of Muhammad, you are khawarij, you are innovators.

Shaykh Abd al-Latif ibn Abd al-Rahman said: This is an old disease among the people of shirk and ta'til. Whoever declared them kafir for worshiping others besides Allah, or for negating His attributes and realities of His names, they said: You are like the khawarij, who declare sins as kufr and rely on the outward appearances of verses.

Salih al-Qawzan noted: The reality of the khawarij is that they declare Muslims kafir for committing major sins without shirk. In our time, some misuse this label, calling those who rule with kufr on the rightful apostates and violators of Islam, such as grave worshipers or destroyers of Islamic principles, khawarij, claiming they excommunicate Muslims. They do not understand Islam nor its nullifiers, nor the real methodology of the khawarij, which is to declare kufr on those who do not deserve it. Declaring kufr on someone who truly committed a nullifier of Islam is the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama'ah.

Many scholars of tawhid and sunnah suffered from this false slander. Prominent examples include:

Amir ibn Abd Qais al-Anbari, the noble tabi'i, ascetic, and pious figure. He was falsely accused of rebellion against imams to defend oppressed non-Muslims, avoiding Muslim sacrifices, and refusing to marry Muslim women, claiming similarity to Ibrahim. These accusations were refuted by scholars.

Muhammad ibn Bashir al-Qadi, student of Imam Malik ibn Anas, known for his knowledge, justice, and refusal to validate unjust testimony, was accused of being kharij and haruri.

Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal, accused by malicious scholars for his strict adherence to Sunnah, especially in the trial of khalq al-Quran, and for not unjustly declaring Muslims kafir.

Ahmad ibn Muhammad Abu Umar al-Tulmunki, a scholar of Qur'an, hadith, and jurisprudence, falsely accused of haruriyyah, defended and supported by judicial witnesses.

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, falsely accused of khawarij and takfir by his enemies due to his firmness against bid'ah and falsehood and exposing the injustice of tyrants.

Ibn al-Qayyim, student of Shaykh al-Islam, also suffered from this slander, being accused of kufr by opponents. He stated in Al-Kafiyah al-Shafiyah: Some people take the outward text without understanding the intended meanings, as the khawarij did.

Abu Abdullah al-Dhahabi, accused of haruriyyah and takfir by malicious scholars, was said to have a kharij tendency.

Shaykh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers were also falsely accused of khuruj against the Sunnah. Many scholars initially fell for these accusations before understanding the reality of the Najdī call, such as Muhammad ibn Nasir al-Hazmi, Sadiq Hasan Khan, and Al-Alusi.

Two points most criticized about Shaykh Muhammad and his followers were: declaring polytheists such as grave worshipers and secularists as kafir, and fighting the polytheists, secularists, tyrants, and their supporters.

Imam Ibn Khuzaymah said: Whoever does not affirm that Allah istawa over His Throne above seven heavens is a kafir whose blood is lawful and whose wealth is spoils.
Al-Dhahabi commented: This statement is true, but many later scholars could not tolerate it.

The reason is that many later scholars revered the sayings of the salaf in matters of iman and kufr, yet inwardly followed the view of Jahmiyyah, resulting in a mixture: outwardly following the salaf, inwardly the Jahmiyyah. Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah warned: Many later scholars cannot distinguish between the views of the salaf and the views of the Murji'ah and Jahmiyyah, mixing them in their statements while inwardly holding Jahmiyyah positions.

He further explained: Those who support Jahm's view on iman may outwardly quote the salaf in wording but contradict them in meaning, showing the danger of outwardly following the salaf while inwardly adhering to innovation.

He also said: The salaf should establish general principles to judge specific cases in matters of kufr and takfir, otherwise ignorance in particulars and generalities leads to great corruption.

The principles referenced are as follows:

First Principle:

Kufr is defined by shar'i criteria. Kufr is what Allah and His Messenger have declared as disbelief, and the kafir is the one whom Allah and His Messenger have designated as such. This opposes the view of the people of bid'ah and desires who claim that kufr is determined by rational reasoning, such that what reason deems disbelief is considered kufr and what it does not deem kufr is excused.

Second Principle:

The evidence for kufr is derived from the sources of shar'i rulings: the Qur'an, whether the dalalah (indication) is qat'i (certain) or dhanni (probable); the Sunnah, whether the thubut (authenticity) and dalalah are qat'i or dhanni or mixed; ijma' sahih; and qiyas on the mansus.

Kufr is therefore divided into matters agreed upon and matters of disagreement. Among the agreed upon: shirk with Allah, denial of obligatory matters of religion such as salah, sawm, zakah, hajj, discarding the mus-haf in filth, denial of resurrection and the nubuwwat. Among disputed matters: leaving salah, engaging in magic, lying about the Prophet ﷺ, and the like.

Abu Hamid al-Ghazali in *Faysal al-Tafriqah* stated: “Kufr is a shar‘i ruling, like slavery and freedom. Its essence includes the permissibility of blood, the ruling of hellfire, and its indicator is shar‘i, derived either by text or by analogy..”

Thus, the evidence for kufr and takfir may be dhanni, such as reports of ahad, general indications, and in relation to wala’ and bara’. Ibn Abd al-Barr stated regarding acting upon reports of ahad: “What we say is that it obliges action even without certainty, like the testimony of two or four witnesses. All fuqaha and scholars accept reports of a just person in belief and act upon it in wala’ and bara’, making it binding in shar‘ and din.”

There may also be qat‘i evidence, and it is not required to have certainty in the evidence for kufr and takfir, contrary to the views of the Jahmiyyah, Mu‘tazilah, Ash‘ariyyah, and many mutakallimun.

Third Principle:

The reasons for kufr—the causes, conditions, and absence of impediments—may be dhanni or qat‘i. Words and actions may indicate kufr either by probability or certainty. The stipulation of certainty in acts or statements as evidence for kufr is invalid.

Al-Ghazali stated: “It should not be thought that takfir must be certain in every case; it is a shar‘i ruling, like other rulings concerning the permissibility of wealth, blood, and punishment in hellfire.”

Abd al-Rahman ibn Yahya al-Mu‘allimi al-Yamani stated in *Kitab al-‘Ibadah*: “Scholars have ruled on riddah based on some matters being certain and some probable; hence there is no justification for the claim that kufr is only by a matter of consensus. If a person utters a word of kufr without clear indication to the contrary, he is considered kafir, and weak possibilities are irrelevant.”

Fourth Principle:

Evidence accepted in courts, such as testimony and confession, is often dhanni. Al-Mu‘allimi al-Yamani: “The ruling follows the apparent matter. Hence, two witnesses confirming apostasy obliges ruling: the person is not prayed over, not buried in Muslim cemeteries, and treated as an apostate.”

Fifth Principle:

The default for one who commits kufr among mukallafun is kufr if the cause occurs and no impediment exists.

1. If the kafir knows of a specific impediment, takfir is invalid because the impediment negates the cause.

2. If he knows no impediment exists, takfir is required.

3. If knowledge of impediment is uncertain, the fuqaha and scholars allow acting on the cause in the absence of contradiction, without seeking the impediment.

For example, regarding a captive who apostatises, Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri and Rabi‘ah ibn Abi Abd al-Rahman stated: “If the captive apostatises and it is unknown whether compulsion existed, separate his wealth and wife. If compelled, do not separate them but suspend his wealth for his wife.”

Imam Malik ibn Anas stated: “If the captive apostatised voluntarily, separate his wealth and wife. If compelled, do not. If unknown, separate and suspend the wealth.”

This applies principle three: either an impediment is known (no takfir) or unknown (takfir applies), and probability alone does not prevent action.

Sixth Principle:

The kafir is anyone with knowledge of the reason for kufr; this includes the common person in matters of necessary religion, provided they understand the issue, with the condition of knowledge.

Seventh Principle:

Takfir applies to a mukallaf adult and also to a discerning child (mumayyiz) even if not baligh, according to the majority of scholars. Ibn Taymiyyah: “The apostasy of a discerning child is valid according to most scholars. If he apostatises, he is considered an apostate, even if his parents are Muslim, and is disciplined more severely than leaving salah, but not killed until adulthood.”

Ibn al-Qayyim agreed: “The apostasy of a discerning child is recognized by most scholars; disciplinary measures apply more severely than for neglecting salah, though killing is deferred until adulthood.”

Eighth Principle:

In takfir, consider conditions and impediments recognized by scholars, such as intellect, choice, compulsion, or insanity.

Ninth Principle:

Hadith and athar do not establish a separate methodology for takfir; opinions are weighed according to Qur’an, Sunnah, ijma‘, and correct qiyas. Many books on takfir among Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jama‘ah reflect opinions of scholars, not necessarily the methodology of the salaf. Ibn Taymiyyah: “The methodology of the salaf is known through transmission of their statements or those well-informed of their views.”

In summary: the mujahideen do not agree with the khawarij on any of their well-known principles, such as takfir for sins. Abu al-Hasan al-Ash‘ari stated:

1. The khawarij agreed on declaring Ali ibn Abi Talib kafir for arbitration, debating whether it was shirk.

2. Most khawarij considered every major sin to be kufr, and every kufr as shirk, and every shirk as worship of Shaytan.

3. They agreed Allah punishes major sinners eternally, except the Najdat.

4. All khawarij held the doctrine of created Qur'an.

5. The khawarij rejected the imamate of Uthman ibn 'Affan and Ali ibn Abi Talib, declared Mu'awiyah and Amr ibn al-'As kafir.

6. They considered imamate reserved for Quraysh if deserving.

7. They required rebellion against a unjust imam.

8. The Najdat stated no need for an imam, only adherence to the Qur'an.

9. The khawarij denied punishment in the grave.

No Salafi-jihadi current agrees with these principles. The khawarij methodology is specific to them, and shared rulings cannot be attributed to them. For example, the Shafi'i madhhab includes rulings specific to it, not general shar'i rulings. Attempts to attribute khawarij principles to Salafi-jihadi scholars fail.

It is recommended for the questioner to ignore slanders against the mujahideen and people of tawhid, and remain steadfast on jihad, seeking Allah's guidance.

Question 5: What is the ruling on abandoning jihad for Allah? Is self-struggle sufficient? Does responsibility lie with the individual or state? What about accusations against mujahideen as terrorists?

The answer: abandoning jihad for worldly law is kufr and riddah. Abandoning obligatory jihad with capacity is a major sin but not kufr. Today, jihad is fard 'ayn upon the capable and is among the most important deeds after tawhid and iman.

Imam Abu al-'Abbas al-Qurtubi stated: "At times jihad surpasses other deeds, especially when the enemy dominates Muslims, as in this era. Jihad today is most urgent due to oppression by enemies."

Al-Qadi Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi: "Jihad is fard by consensus. Its obligation varies: sometimes upon all when the enemy attacks, sometimes upon kafayah. Today, it is fard 'ayn due to enemy occupation."

Al-Tabari: "It is incumbent upon each capable individual until the need is met."

Abu Bakr al-Jassas: "If people fear for their lands and families, it is wajib for the community to defend them."

Ibn Hazm: "If the enemy attacks, anyone able must aid."

Abu al-Hasan al-Wahidi: “Jihad is fard kafayah unless the enemy enters Muslim lands, then fard ‘ayn.”

Ibn ‘Atiyah: “Jihad remains fard kafayah, except when the enemy enters Islamic territory, then wajib on all.”

Abd Allah ibn Sa‘id ibn Abi Jamrah al-Azdi: “Jihad wajib upon all capable individuals; parents need not consent if the enemy attacks their village. For fard kafayah, parental consent suffices. Abandoning jihad for lack of consent is permissible but leaving the best is blameworthy.”

Self-struggle (jihad al-nafs) is part of jihad. Types of jihad include by heart, tongue, wealth, and hand. Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim stated all must engage in some form. Ibn Hajar: jihad against kuffar wajib by hand, tongue, wealth, or heart.

Responsibility: fard kafayah falls primarily on the ruler/state; fard ‘ayn falls on all capable individuals. Accusing mujahideen falsely of terrorism is fisq, as it criminalizes truth and encourages submission to the enemy, while discrediting mujahideen defending Islam.

Ali ibn Sultan al-Qari stated: “Some call their ruler just, but our scholars declared that claiming the ruler is just renders one kafir; true justice is by Allah’s standard, not worldly perception.”

Question 6: Those who believe in grave-worshipping shirk but do not fight: can they be targeted?

Answer: One who holds grave-worshipping beliefs, invokes the dead, or engages in shirk acts is considered kafir and mushrik, even if not participating in fighting. They may be killed or fought after being called to tawhid; if killed before da‘wah, there is no objection.

Abu al-Wafa’ ibn ‘Aqil al-Hanbali: “Due to difficulty, the ignorant adjusted shar‘i rulings to simplify matters. They are considered kafir for practices such as grave-worship, lighting fires, kissing graves, or invoking the dead.”

This is narrated by Abu al-Faraj ibn al-Jawzi in *Talbis Iblis*, confirmed by Ibn al-Qayyim and Shaykh Abd al-Latif ibn Abd al-Rahman al-Sheikh in *Durar al-Saniyyah*.

Allah is the Guide to the straight path, and may peace and blessings be upon our Prophet Muhammad ﷺ, his family, and companions.

Translated by your brothers at

al-Firdous Media Foundation

Sha’ban 1447 AH | January 2026